

29th March 1928]

- (b) The property tax is, under the existing Act, leviable at the same rate on both lands and buildings. It is proposed so to amend the Act as to empower municipal councils to levy the property tax on lands at a rate different from that on buildings. It is not intended to exempt altogether agricultural lands from liability to property tax.

Mr. V. RAMJEE RAO :—“ May I know, Sir, when the Bill is likely to be introduced ? ”

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“ The Bill is almost ready now. ”

Forests

Death of Mr. Ponnayya, Forest Ranger, Cumbum taluk.

* 1818 Q.—Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state in reference to answers given to question No. 795 answered on 21st October 1927, regarding the death of Mr. Ponnayya, Forest Ranger, Cumbum taluk—

(a) who it was that held the enquiry that is referred to in clause (a) of the answer to that question and where;

(b) whether Mr. Ponnayya's wife made a representation to the Collector and whether the villagers of Giddalore sent up petitions to him and the other officers concerned;

(c) what it was that was alleged in the representation and the petitions;

(d) whether the District Magistrate ever held any enquiry at all;

(e) whether it is a fact that the acting Conservator of Forests summoned 14 witnesses to appear at Diguvametta and then desisted from enquiry;

(f) whether the village munsif concerned failed to make a report of the affair and whether the Divisional Magistrate fined him Rs. 2 for it remarking at the same time that the Sub-Inspector who advised the village munsif that he need not send a report was wrong; and

(g) whether any explanation was taken from the Sub-Inspector in this matter?

A.—(a) The Circle Inspector of Police and the Stationary Sub-Magistrate, Giddalore, made the enquiry at Thirumulla and Giddalore, respectively.

(b) & (c) The answer to (b) is that no petition was received by the Collector of Kurnool.

(d) No.

(e) No.

(f) The village munsif was fined Rs. 2, and the Subdivisional Magistrate, Markapur, also remarked in his order that the Sub-Inspector had no business to ask the village magistrate not to make a report.

(g) No.

[29th March 1928]

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—“ The answer to the question is . . . ”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ The hon. Member need not read the question and answer. ”

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—“ The answer to clause (b) does not state anything about the representation made by Mr. Ponnayya's wife. Am I to take it that the Collector did not receive that representation ? ”

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—“ The answer has been given already. ”

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—“ May I know with reference to clause (e) whether the Government are aware that 13 villagers of Diguvametta received summons to appear for the said enquiry ? ”

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—“ I am not aware of it. ”

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—“ May I know from the hon. the Law Member with reference to the answer to (g) in view of the fact that the Sub-divisional Magistrate, Markapur, did make a statement against the conduct of the Police officer, whether the Government considered that an explanation was not called for ? ”

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—“ I shall look into the matter. ”

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO : “ May I know with reference to answer to clause (a) whether it was only the Sub-Inspector whose conduct has come into question who conducted the enquiry into the whole matter and whether no other officer enquired on the spot ? ”

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—“ The Circle Inspector enquired into the matter. ”

Forest grievances of the ryots in Kallikota and Atagada estates.

* 1819 Q.—Mr. N. SIVA RAJ : Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received any representations from the ryots of Kallikota and Atagada estates in the Kudala taluk of Ganjam district laying down their various forest grievances ;

(b) the number of such petitions sent to them and also to the Collector of Ganjam ; and

(c) whether they propose to enquire into the matter ?

A. —(a) Yes.

(b) The Government received four such petitions during 1924 and 1925. The Government understand that the Collector of Ganjam has received such petitions from twenty-two villagers since 14th December 1927.

(c) The Government enquired into the grievances brought to their notice and have already passed orders on the petitions sent to them. As regards the petitions received by the Collector, the Government understand that the matter is under enquiry.